

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated July 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 20, 2006

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and 2. These sheets, which includes Figs. 1 and 2, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated July 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 20, 2006

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 9, 11, and 13 through 20 remain in this application. Claims 10, 12 and 19 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claim 21 has been added.

#### Part 1 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted herewith are replacement sheets that correct the items identified in the objection of the Office Action. Specifically, in Figure 1, reference numbers "20" and "21" have been added. In Figure 2, reference numbers "24" and "33" have been added, while a leadline has been added for the reference number "28". Further, "hinges" and "secondary stair assembly" have been removed from the claims. "Telescopic legs" have been depicted in Figure 1.

In light of the proposed drawing amendment, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

#### Part 2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 20 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 through 20 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated July 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 20, 2006

**Parts 3 through 6 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 through 3, 7, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anstead.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anstead in view of Greenwood.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anstead in view of Greenwood and further in view of Robinson.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anstead in view of Greenwood and further in view of Robinson.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires (emphasis added):

wherein said platform assembly includes:

a support frame assembly comprising a plurality of lateral extents and a plurality of longitudinal extents connecting the plurality of lateral extents; and

a plurality of leg members for providing vertical support to said support frame assembly, each of said leg members being pivotally coupled to said support frame assembly, each one of said plurality of leg members; and

a plurality of decking members removably mounted on said support frame assembly for forming said top surface of said platform assembly;

*wherein said support frame assembly includes a first portion and a second portion, each of said first and second portions including at least one of said longitudinal extents and a plurality of said lateral extents, said plurality of said lateral extents of said first portion being removably coupleable to said plurality of said lateral extents of said second portion; and*

wherein each of said leg members is mounted on one of said lateral extents and is pivotable into a substantially parallel orientation to said lateral extent.

It is submitted that neither the Anstead nor the Greenwood patent leads one of ordinary skill in the art to this combination of requirements of claim 1,

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated July 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 20, 2006

particularly the requirement highlighted above, which provides the claimed invention with enhanced compactness and portability of the platform assembly when being transported or stored.

It is therefore submitted that the Anstead patent would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the applicant's claimed invention as defined in claim 1, especially with the requirements set forth above, and therefore it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art. Further, claims 2, 3, 7 and 11, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 9, 11, and 13 through 18 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Part 7 of the Office Action**

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that claims 19 and 20 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the requirements of claim 19 into the recitation of claim 18, and therefore claim 18 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 20, by virtue of its dependency from amended claim 18, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated July 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 20, 2006

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. **40,158**  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date:

